arXiv:1210.0172v1 [math.NA] 30 Sep 2012

ENHANCEMENTS OF PELLET'S THEOREM FOR MATRIX POLYNOMIALS

A. Melman
Department of Applied Mathematics
School of Engineering, Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, CA 95053
e-mail : amelman@scu.edu

Abstract

We derive and then enhance a generalized matrix version of Pellet's theorem, itself based on a generalized Rouché theorem for matrix-valued functions to generate upper, lower, and internal bounds on the eigenvalues of matrix polynomials. The matrix version of Pellet's theorem is subsequently used to improve the original scalar theorem.

Key words : matrix polynomial, Pellet, zero, root, eigenvalue, bound

AMS(MOS) subject classification : 12D10, 15A18, 30C15

1 Introduction

Polynomial eigenvalue problems have been investigated for quite some time ([7], [12], [13]) and have important applications in a wide range of engineering fields such as vibration analysis, acoustics, and fluid mechanics - to name just a few ([19]). It is, in general, costly to compute polynomial eigenvalues for large problems, but bounds on such eigenvalues are relatively easy to obtain. They provide information on the location of eigenvalues that can be used by iterative methods for computing them and are also useful in the computation of pseudospectra.

The polynomial eigenvalue problem is to find a nonzero eigenvector v, corresponding to an eigenvalue z satisfying $P(z)v = 0$, where

$$P(z) = A_n z^n + A_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_0,$$

with $A_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ for $j = 0, \ldots n$. We will assume throughout that $\det(P(z))$ is not identically zero. If A_n is singular then P has infinite eigenvalues and if A_0 is singular then zero is an eigenvalue. There are nm eigenvalues, including possibly infinite ones. The finite eigenvalues are the solutions of $\det(P(z)) = 0$.

To explain the aims of this work, we start with the scalar polynomial with complex coefficients

$$p(z) = a_n z^n + a_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 \ ,$$

and $a_n a_0 \neq 0$. If ζ is a zero of p, then for $a_k \neq 0$ with $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ we have

$$-a_k \zeta^k = a_n \zeta^n + a_{n-1} \zeta^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{k+1} \zeta^{k+1} + a_{k-1} \zeta^{k-1} + \cdots + a_0 \ ,$$

and an analogous equality for $k = 0, n$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |a_k| \, |\zeta|^k &= \left| a_n \zeta^n + a_{n-1} \zeta^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{k+1} \zeta^{k+1} + a_{k-1} \zeta^{k-1} + \cdots + a_0 \right| \\ &\leq |a_n| \, |\zeta|^n + |a_{n-1}| \, |\zeta|^{n-1} + \cdots + |a_{k+1}| \, |\zeta|^{k+1} + |a_{k-1}| \, |\zeta|^{k-1} + \cdots + |a_0| \ . \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Applying the equivalent of inequality (1) with $k = n$, we obtain that $|\zeta|$ must satisfy

$$|a_n|\,|\zeta|^n - |a_{n-1}|\,|\zeta|^{n-1} - \cdots - |a_1||\zeta| - |a_0| \leq 0\ .$$

This means that $|\zeta|$ can be no larger than the unique positive root of

$$|a_n|x^n - |a_{n-1}|x^{n-1} - \cdots - |a_1|x - |a_0| = 0\ .$$

Analogously, one finds that $|\zeta|$ can be no smaller than the unique positive root of

$$|a_n|x^n + |a_{n-1}|x^{n-1} + \cdots + |a_1|x - |a_0| = 0\ .$$

These results are due to Cauchy ([4], [14, Theorem (27,1), p.122]).

When we apply inequality (1) with $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $a_k \neq 0$, we obtain

$$|a_n|\,|\zeta|^n + |a_{n-1}|\,|\zeta|^{n-1} + \cdots + |a_{k+1}|\,|\zeta|^{k+1} - |a_k|\,|\zeta|^k + |a_{k-1}|\,|\zeta|^{k-1} + \cdots + |a_0| \geq 0\ . \quad (2)$$

Now, the equation

$$|a_n|x^n + |a_{n-1}|x^{n-1} + \cdots + |a_{k+1}|x^{k+1} - |a_k|x^k + |a_{k-1}|x^{k-1} + \cdots + |a_0| = 0$$

has, by Descartes' rule, either two or no positive roots. If it has no positive roots or if the two positive roots coincide, then inequality (2) is always satisfied and provides no information on $|\zeta|$. However, if it has two distinct positive roots, say x_1 and x_2 with $x_1 < x_2$, then inequality (2) implies that either $|\zeta| \leq x_1$ or $|\zeta| \geq x_2$ and that no zero of p has a modulus in (x_1, x_2). As a straightforward consequence of Rouché's theorem, Pellet's theorem makes this result more precise. It is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1 *(**Pellet**, [17], [14, Th.(28,1), p.128]) Given the polynomial $p(z) = z^n + a_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 z + a_0$ with complex coefficients, $a_0 a_k \neq 0$, and $n \geq 3$. Let $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, and let the polynomial*

$$f_k(x) = x^n + |a_{n-1}|x^{n-1} + \cdots + |a_{k+1}|x^{k+1} - |a_k|x^k + |a_{k-1}|x^{k-1} + \cdots + |a_0|$$

have two distinct positive roots x_1 and x_2 with $x_1 < x_2$. Then p has exactly k zeros in or on the circle $|z| = x_1$ and no zeros in the annular ring $x_1 < |z| < x_2$.

This means that Cauchy's results can be considered as a special limit case of Pellet's theorem.

We first generalize Pellet's theorem (and therefore also Cauchy's results) to matrix polynomials. The standard proof of Pellet's theorem uses Rouché's theorem for analytical functions, which suggests that a generalized version of Rouché's theorem for analytical matrix-valued functions will be needed. Such a theorem can be derived as a special case of the generalized Rouché theorem for bounded linear operators in [8, Theorem 9.2, p. 206] (see also [6]). It is then a fairly straightforward exercise to generalize Pellet's theorem. We note that, based on a different and slightly more restricted generalization of Rouché's theorem, a generalized Pellet theorem was recently also derived in [3], where it was used to determine initial approximations for the numerical computation of the eigenvalues of a matrix polynomial with iterative methods like the Ehrlich-Aberth method ([1], [2], [5]). To our knowledge, [3] is the first time Pellet's theorem has been generalized to matrix polynomials.

Our main goal is to find ways to overcome situations where f_k in Theorem 1.1 (or an analogous polynomial for the generalized version of that theorem) does not have positive roots for a particular value of k. This problem does not seem to have been addressed elsewhere in the literature. It occurs frequently even when there is a significant gap between groups of zeros (or eigenvalues). In addition, only polynomials with very special coefficients would have more than a few values of k for which the theorem can be applied. We will explore two ideas to tackle this problem: one for both scalar and matrix polynomials and one for scalar polynomials, which in some cases will lead, perhaps paradoxically, to an improvement of the original (scalar) version of Pellet's theorem by using its generalized (matrix) version. At the same time, this approach can also improve the upper and lower bounds resulting from Cauchy's result mentioned above.

We will not dwell on the numerical problem of finding the roots of functions like f_k in Theorem 1.1, if they exist. An efficient way to compute them can be found in [15], while bounds on such roots were derived in [3]. The number of arithmetic operations that this requires is typically dwarfed by the much more costly computation of the eigenvalues of a matrix polynomial. Moreover, this work focuses on the enhancement of Pellet's theorem *if and when* this theorem is being used. It does not focus on whether or not it should be used in the first place, as this depends very much on external factors.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we review a few preliminaries that will be needed in the later sections. In Section 3 we derive the generalized Pellet theorem and in Section 4 we propose two strategies to improve it, along with numerical examples.

2 Preliminaries

Since it is mentioned several times, we begin by stating Rouché's well-known theorem.

Theorem 2.1 *(***Rouché***, [18], [11, Theorem 1.6]) Let f and g be analytic in the interior of a simple closed curve C and continuous on C, and let $|g(z)| < |f(z)|$ for all $z \in C$. Then $f + g$ and f have the same number of zeros in the interior of the curve.*

All matrix norms throughout this work are assumed to be vector-induced (or *subordinate*). The main matrix norms we will use are the 1-Norm, ∞-Norm, and the 2-Norm (or *spectral norm*), defined ([10, p. 294-295]) for $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ with elements a_{ij} by

$$\begin{aligned} ||A||_1 &= \max_{1\le j\le n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_{ij}| = ||A^*||_\infty \ , \\ ||A||_\infty &= \max_{1\le i\le n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |a_{ij}| = ||A^*||_1 \ , \\ ||A||_2 &= \max\left\{\sqrt{\lambda}\ :\ \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } A^*A\right\} = ||A^*||_2 \ . \end{aligned}$$

The zeros of a monic polynomial $p(z) = z^n + a_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0$ with complex coefficients are the eigenvalues of its $n \times n$ companion matrix

$$C(p) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & -a_0 \\ 1 & & & -a_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & 1 & -a_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} .$$

Likewise, the eigenvalues of the monic matrix polynomial

$$P(z) = Iz^n + A_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0 \ ,$$

where $A_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, n-1$, are given by the eigenvalues of the $nm \times nm$ block companion matrix

$$C(P) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & -A_0 \\ I & & & -A_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & I & -A_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} ,$$

with I the $m \times m$ identity matrix. Since the size of I will usually be clear from the context, it will be omitted from the notation.

The reciprocal polynomial of $p(z) = z^n + a_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0$ with $a_0 \neq 0$ is defined by $p_r(z) = z^n p(1/z)/a_0$. Its zeros are the reciprocals of the zeros of p. Likewise, the reciprocal matrix polynomial of $P(z) = Iz^n + A_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0$ with $A_j \in C^{m\times m}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, n-1$ and A_0 nonsingular is defined by $P_r(z) = z^n A_0^{-1} P(1/z)$. Its eigenvalues are the reciprocals of the eigenvalues of P.

3 Generalized Rouché and Pellet theorems

To formulate the operator generalization of Rouché's theorem that we will use later, we need the following definitions for which we have used similar notation and style as in [8, Chapter XI]. We denote by $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ the space of all bounded linear operators from X to Y, where X and Y are complex Banach spaces. When $X = Y$, this space is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(X)$. A bounded linear operator $S : X \to Y$, where X and Y are complex Banach spaces is called a *Fredholm operator* if its range Im S is closed and if dim(Ker S) and dim(Y/ImS) are finite. If X and Y are finite dimensional, then S is always Fredholm.

For an open connected subset Ω of $\mathbb{C}$, let $Q : \Omega \to \mathcal{L}(X)$ be a bounded operator function that is analytic on Ω and let Γ be a simple closed curve in Ω such that its inner domain is a subset of Ω. Then Q is said to be *normal with respect to* Γ if $Q(z)$ is invertible for all $z \in \Gamma$ and $Q(z)$ is Fredholm on the inner domain of Γ. Finally, we recall that a Hilbert space is separable if and only if it has a countable orthonormal basis.

The following theorem generalizes Rouché's theorem for operator-valued functions. We have stated it as it appears in [8, p. 206], but a similar version was already published in [6].

Theorem 3.1 (Generalized Rouché theorem for operators.) *([6], [8]) Let* $W, S : \Omega \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ *be analytic operator functions, where* Ω *is an open connected subset of* $\mathbb{C}$ *and* H *is a separable Hilbert space, and assume that* W *is normal with respect to the simple closed curve* $\Gamma \subseteq \Omega$.

If $||W(z)^{-1}S(z)|| < 1$ *for all* $z \in \Gamma$*, then* $W + S$ *is also normal with respect to* Γ *and* $W + S$ *and* W *have the same number of finite eigenvalues inside* Γ*, counting multiplicities.*

The norm used in the previous theorem can be any norm, induced by a norm on H. We obtain the following generalized Rouché theorem for analytic matrix-valued functions as an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1. We note that matrix polynomials are special cases of such functions.

Theorem 3.2 (Generalized Rouché theorem for matrices.) *Let* $A, B : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ *be analytic matrix-valued functions, where* Ω *is an open connected subset of* $\mathbb{C}$ *and assume that* $A(z)$ *is nonsingular for all* z *on the simple closed curve* $\Gamma \subseteq \Omega$.

If $||A(z)^{-1}B(z)|| < 1$ *for all* $z \in \Gamma$*, then* $\det(A+B)$ *and* $\det(A)$ *have the same number of zeros inside* Γ*, counting multiplicities.*

Proof. The proof follows directly from Theorem 3.1. In this case, $H \equiv \mathbb{C}^n$, a finite dimensional Hilbert space which is (trivially) separable and $\mathcal{L}\ (H) \equiv \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$. Furthermore, since A is a matrix, it is a bounded linear operator that is normal with respect to Γ because $A(z)$ is invertible for all $z \in \Gamma$ and, since $\mathbb{C}^n$ is finite dimensional, $A(z)$ is (trivially) a Fredholm operator for any z in the interior of Γ. By Theorem 3.1, $A + B$ is then also normal with respect to Γ and has the same number of finite eigenvalues inside Γ as A, which means that $\det(A + B)$ and $\det(A)$ have the same number of zeros inside Γ, counting multiplicities. $\Box$

Remarks. (1) The norm in Theorem 3.2 can be any matrix norm, induced by a norm on $\mathbb{C}^m$.

(2) Since $||A^{-1}(z)B(z)|| \le ||A^{-1}(z)|| \cdot ||B(z)||$, it is sufficient that $||B(z)|| < ||A^{-1}(z)||^{-1}$ for the condition $||A^{-1}(z)B(z)|| < 1$ to be satisfied.

Finally, Theorem 3.2 leads to the following generalization of Pellet's theorem (Theorem 1.1).

Theorem 3.3 (Generalized Pellet theorem.) *Let*

$$P(z) = A_n z^n + A_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0$$

be a matrix polynomial with $n \ge 2$, $A_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ *for* $j = 0, \ldots, n$*, and* $A_0 \ne 0$*. Let* A_k *be invertible for some* k *with* $1 \le k \le n-1$*, and let the polynomial*

$$f_k(x) = ||A_n||x^n + ||A_{n-1}||x^{n-1} + \cdots + ||A_{k+1}||x^{k+1} - ||A_k^{-1}||^{-1}x^k + ||A_{k-1}||x^{k-1} + \cdots + ||A_1||x + ||A_0||$$

have two distinct positive roots x_1 *and* x_2 *with* $x_1 < x_2$*. Then* P *has exactly* km *zeros in or on the disk* $|z| = x_1$ *and no zeros in the annular ring* $x_1 < |z| < x_2$*.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.2, if

$$\left|\left|\left(A_k z^k\right)^{-1}\left(A_n z^n + A_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_{k+1}z^{k+1} + A_{k-1}z^{k-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0\right)\right|\right| < 1 \tag{3}$$

for $|z| = x$, then P and $A_k z^k$ both have the same number of eigenvalues in the open disk $|z| < x$, namely, km.

From Remark (2) following the proof of Theorem 3.2, a sufficient condition for inequality (3) to be satisfied is

$$\left|\left|A_n z^n + A_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_{k+1}z^{k+1} + A_{k-1}z^{k-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0\right|\right| < \left|\left|\left(A_k z^k\right)^{-1}\right|\right|^{-1} . \tag{4}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\left|A_n z^n + A_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_{k+1}z^{k+1} + A_{k-1}z^{k-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0\right|\right| \\ &\le ||A_n||\,|z|^n + ||A_{n-1}||\,|z|^{n-1} + \cdots + ||A_{k+1}||\,|z|^{k+1} + ||A_{k-1}||\,|z|^{k-1} + \cdots + ||A_1||\,|z| + ||A_0|| ,\end{aligned}$$

inequality (4) will be satisfied for $|z| = x$ whenever x is such that

$$||A_n||x^n + ||A_{n-1}||x^{n-1} + \cdots + ||A_{k+1}||x^{k+1} + ||A_{k-1}||x^{k-1} + \cdots + ||A_1||x + ||A_0|| < ||A_k^{-1}||^{-1}x^k , \tag{5}$$

i.e., when $f_k(x) < 0$, where f_k was defined in the statement of the theorem. By Descartes' rule, f_k has either two or no positive roots. Since it was assumed that f_k has two positive roots x_1 and x_2 and since $f_k(0) > 0$, inequality (5) will be satisfied for any x such that $x_1 < x < x_2$. This concludes the proof. ◻

Remarks. (1) Applying Theorem 3.3 to the matrix polynomial $A_k^{-1}P$ yields better values for x_1 and x_2 since $||A_k^{-1}A_j|| \le ||A_k^{-1}||\,||A_j||$. The disadvantage is that all the coefficients need to be multiplied by A_k^{-1}, which could be costly.

(2) A version of Theorem 3.3 (applied to $A_k^{-1}P$) was also obtained by Bini, Noferini, and Sharify in [3] by using a different generalization of Rouché's theorem from [16] and [20], which limits their result to the spectral norm. Because it is based on Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 holds for any matrix norm induced by a vector norm. This becomes more important as the size of the coefficient matrices increases because the spectral norm can be costly to evaluate, whereas, e.g., the 1-Norm and ∞-Norm can be computed cheaply.

(3) Whether the polynomial f_k will have two positive roots depends on the relative sizes of its coefficients. Generally speaking, this will happen when the coefficient of x^k is large compared to most of the other coefficients, but it would be very difficult to predict how large it needs to be. As in the scalar case, if f_k does not have positive zeros, then Theorem 3.3 provides no information about a possible gap between groups of eigenvalues. In the next section we propose ways to sometimes overcome this problem.

The following theorem, which is a generalization of Cauchy's result, can be considered as a special limit case of the generalized Pellet theorem just as in the scalar case. Its proof is entirely analogous and will therefore be omitted.

Theorem 3.4 (Generalized Cauchy theorem.) *All eigenvalues of the matrix polynomial*

$$P(z) = A_n z^n + A_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0 \ ,$$

where $A_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$, for $j = 0, \ldots, n$, lie in $|z| \leq R$ when A_n is nonsingular, and lie in $|z| \geq r$ when A_0 is nonsingular, where R and r are the unique positive roots of

$$||A_n^{-1}||^{-1} x^n - ||A_{n-1}|| x^{n-1} - \cdots - ||A_1|| x - ||A_0|| = 0$$

and

$$||A_n|| x^n + ||A_{n-1}|| x^{n-1} + \cdots + ||A_1|| x - ||A_0^{-1}||^{-1} = 0 \ ,$$

respectively.

This theorem was also derived in a different way as Lemma 3.1 in [9]. Again, it can be applied to $A_n^{-1} P$ and $A_0^{-1} P$ to yield tighter bounds, but at the expense of adding n multiplications of two $m \times m$ matrices.

4 Enhancements of the generalized Cauchy and Pellet theorems

4.1 Squaring and repartitioning

The following lemma shows that by squaring the block companion matrix and repartitioning the result, additional Cauchy-type and Pellet-type bounds can be generated.

Lemma 4.1 *The squares of the eigenvalues of the monic matrix polynomial*

$$P(z) = I z^n + A_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + A_1 z + A_0 \ ,$$

where n is a positive even integer and $A_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, n-1$, are given by the eigenvalues of the matrix polynomial

$$Q(z) = I z^{n/2} + B_{n/2-1} z^{n/2-1} + \cdots + B_1 z + B_0 \ ,$$

where $B_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2m\times 2m}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, n/2 - 1$, with

$$B_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & -A_{n-1}A_0 \\ A_1 & -A_{n-1}A_1 + A_0 \end{pmatrix} \ ; \ B_j = \begin{pmatrix} A_{2j} & -A_{n-1}A_{2j} + A_{2j-1} \\ A_{2j+1} & -A_{n-1}A_{2j+1} + A_{2j} \end{pmatrix} \ , \ j = 1, 2, \ldots, n/2-1 \ .$$

Proof. The companion matrix of P is defined by

$$C(P) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & -A_0 \\ I & & & -A_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & I & -A_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \ ,$$

so that $C^2(P)$, whose eigenvalues are the squares of those of P, is given by

$$C^2(P) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & -A_0 & A_{n-1}A_0 \\ 0 & & & -A_1 & A_{n-1}A_1 - A_0 \\ I & & & -A_2 & A_{n-1}A_2 - A_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ & & I & -A_{n-1} & A_{n-1}^2 - A_{n-2} \end{pmatrix} .$$

Since n is even, $C^2(P)$ can be repartitioned into $n/2$ blocks of size $2m \times 2m$ as follows:

$$C^2(P) = \begin{pmatrix} \boxed{\begin{matrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{matrix}} & & & \boxed{\begin{matrix} -A_0 & A_{n-1}A_0 \\ -A_1 & A_{n-1}A_1 - A_0 \end{matrix}} \\ \boxed{\begin{matrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{matrix}} & & & \boxed{\begin{matrix} -A_2 & A_{n-1}A_2 - A_1 \\ -A_3 & A_{n-1}A_3 - A_2 \end{matrix}} \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & \boxed{\begin{matrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{matrix}} & \boxed{\begin{matrix} -A_{n-2} & A_{n-1}A_{n-2} - A_{n-3} \\ -A_{n-1} & A_{n-1}^2 - A_{n-2} \end{matrix}} \end{pmatrix} .$$

In other words, $C^2(P)$ can be written as

$$C^2(P) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & -B_0 \\ I & & & -B_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & I & -B_{n/2-1} \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where

$$B_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & -A_{n-1}A_0 \\ A_1 & -A_{n-1}A_1 + A_0 \end{pmatrix} \ ; \ B_j = \begin{pmatrix} A_{2j} & -A_{n-1}A_{2j} + A_{2j-1} \\ A_{2j+1} & -A_{n-1}A_{2j+1} + A_{2j} \end{pmatrix} \ , \ j = 1, 2, \ldots, n/2-1 \ ,$$

and where I now stands for the $2m \times 2m$ identity matrix. The expression for $C^2(P)$ in (6) is the block companion matrix $C(Q)$ of the matrix polynomial

$$Q(z) = z^{n/2} + B_{n/2-1}z^{n/2-1} + \cdots + B_1 z + B_0 \ , \tag{6}$$

whose eigenvalues, being the same as those of $C^2(P)$, are the squares of the eigenvalues of P. □

We can now apply Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 to obtain information about the eigenvalues of P by using $C(Q)$ with Q as in (6) that can potentially improve results obtained for $C(P)$. This may take the form of improved upper and/or lower bounds, but it may also be the case that the conditions for the application of Theorem 3.3 can now be satisfied, whereas before they could not, so that a gap between groups of eigenvalues can be computed that would otherwise not have been detected. Furthermore, the degree of Q

is only half that of P which has a generally beneficial effect on computations involving it. Of course, the cost of squaring $C(P)$, while still orders of magnitude lower than that of actually computing the eigenvalues, may not be negligable, depending on the size of m.

Additional bounds can be derived by applying Lemma 4.1 to the reciprocal matrix polynomial P_r, which yields a matrix polynomial that we designate by Q_R. This matrix polynomial is, in general, different from Q_r which is the reciprocal polynomial of Q, defined in (6). The reciprocal of the Cauchy upper bound for P_r or Q_r is equal to the Cauchy lower bound for P or Q, respectively. However, the reciprocal of the Cauchy upper bound for Q_R, while being a lower bound on the moduli of the eigenvalues of P, is, in general, different from the Cauchy lower bound for Q. A analogous situation exists for the reciprocal of the Cauchy lower bound for Q_R.

When n is odd we consider $zP(z)$ instead of $P(z)$, which simply has m extra zero eigenvalues. In such a case, A_0 is the zero matrix, which makes B_0 in Lemma 4.1 singular so that Q cannot be used to obtain a lower bound. To remedy this, one can use $zP_r(z)$: the reciprocal of the upper bound on its largest eigenvalue provides the desired lower bound on the smallest eigenvalue of P.

Many different additional bounds can be derived by considering MP or NQ instead of P or Q for any nonsingular matrices M and N, or by using different scalings of the companion matrices. It would therefore be impractical to compare all possible variants. It is also difficult if not impossible to predict which particular bound will outperform other bounds for any given situation. Instead, we will present several numerical examples to illustrate that our bounds can be valuable complements to existing ones.

Our bounds' complexity for a particular value of k is linear in the degree n and further depends on the coefficient matrices' properties. If, for instance, the coefficients exhibit structure, such as symmetry or sparsity, then the various matrix manipulations involved in their computation generally require fewer operations. The choice of bounds therefore ultimately depends on the situation, which is outside the scope of our discussion.

We observe that Lemma 4.1 can also be applied to scalar polynomials, leading to the slightly counterintuitive situation where the generalized matrix version of the theorem is used to improve the original scalar version.

Lemma 4.1 always provides upper and lower bounds when used together with Theorem 3.4, but it does have limitations when used with Theorem 3.3 since the $2m \times 2m$ matrix coefficients of Q are twice the size of those of P. This leads to the computation of gaps between groups of eigenvalues that contain an even multiple of m, instead of just a multiple of m. Although it is easy to find matrix polynomials for which Lemma 4.1 gives worse bounds, it is just as easy to find examples where it delivers better bounds, as will be shown in the examples below.

Finally, we remark that higher powers of $C(P)$ could similarly be used, although the computational cost involved may render the resulting bounds inefficient.

In Example 1 we compare the upper and lower bounds resulting from Theorem 3.4 combined with Lemma 4.1 for both scalar and matrix polynomials. In Example 2 and Example 3 we compare the bounds resulting from Theorem 3.3 combined with Lemma 4.1 for matrix polynomials and in Example 4 and Example 5 we do the same for scalar polynomials. These examples focus somewhat more on Theorem 3.3 than on Theorem 3.4

since the kind of bounds resulting from it are less frequently mentioned in the literature. Although n is an even number in the examples, this is not essential and similar conclusions can be drawn for odd numbers.

Example 1

For this example we have generated matrix polynomials of degree $n = 10$ with $m = 1, 2, 10, 25$, where $m = 1$ corresponds to a scalar polynomial. They take the form

$$P(z) = Iz^{10} + A_9 z^9 + \cdots + A_0 \ ,$$

where each of the $m \times m$ matrices A_j, for $j = 0, \ldots, 9$, has complex elements whose real and imaginary parts are uniformly distributed in $[-1, 1]$, multiplied by a random number which is uniformly distributed in $[0, 10]$. To each P corresponds a polynomial Q, given by

$$Q(z) = Iz^5 + B_4 z^4 + \cdots + B_0 \ ,$$

where the $2m \times 2m$ matrices B_j, for $j = 0, \ldots, 4$, are defined as in Lemma 4.1. For each value of m, one thousand such random matrix polynomials were generated. We then compared the ratios of the bounds to the moduli of their largest and smallest eigenvalues, respectively. The following upper and lower bounds were compared:

Upper bounds: P : Theorem 3.4 applied to P
Q : Theorem 3.4 applied to Q with Lemma 4.1

Lower bounds: P : Lower bound in Theorem 3.4 applied to P
Q : Lower bound in Theorem 3.4 applied to Q with Lemma 4.1
$A_0^{-1}P$: Lower bound in Theorem 3.4 applied to $A_0^{-1}P$
$B_0^{-1}Q$: Lower bound in Theorem 3.4 applied to $B_0^{-1}Q$ with Lemma 4.1
Q_R : Reciprocal of upper bound in Theorem 3.4 applied to Q_R.

Preceding each bound's description is its corresponding designation in the tables below. We recall that the bound designated by Q_R is obtained by forming Q_R from P_r just as Q is formed from P.

In Table 1 we have listed as percentages the mean of the ratios of the upper bound to the modulus of the largest eigenvalue with their standard deviation between parentheses. For instance, a ratio of 3/2 corresponds to 150%. The closer the number is to 100, the better it is, both for upper and lower bounds. The bounds were computed with the 1-Norm, ∞-Norm, and the 2-Norm. In Table 2 we have listed the number of times each bound was the better bound. In Table 3 and Table 4 the same was done for the lower bounds.

As Table 1 shows, using Lemma 4.1 produces better upper bounds on average for all three norms, except for the case of scalar polynomials. This advantage seems to increase with increasing m. The standard deviations are generally comparable, except for the higher values of m with the 2-Norm, where they are larger for the Q bound. The 2-Norm gives the best results but is, in general, costly to compute. It is also clear from Table 2 that even when a bound is worse on average, there is still a non-negligible number of cases where that bound prevails over the other one.

For the lower bounds, Table 3 and Table 4 show that the advantage goes to Q_R for $m > 1$, while P dominates for $m = 1$. As expected, the bounds $A_0^{-1}P$ and $B_0^{-1}Q$ are better than P and Q, respectively. There were no instances where the latter two delivered the best bound. As for the upper bounds, the 2-Norm gives the best results. The advantage of using Lemma 4.1 is, as with the upper bounds, more pronounced for higher values of m.

m	P	Q
1	116 (17)	131 (18)
2	161 (32)	162 (29)
10	316 (45)	247 (47)
25	481 (62)	312 (67)

1-Norm

m	P	Q
1	116 (17)	122 (18)
2	162 (33)	147 (30)
10	317 (46)	216 (50)
25	481 (62)	271 (71)

∞-Norm

m	P	Q
1	116 (17)	118 (16)
2	140 (28)	133 (23)
10	167 (19)	161 (31)
25	177 (14)	174 (39)

2-Norm

Table 1: Comparison of the upper bounds with $n = 10$.

m	P	Q
1	939	61
2	583	417
10	152	848
25	93	907

1-Norm

m	P	Q
1	759	241
2	275	725
10	136	864
25	90	910

∞-Norm

m	P	Q
1	557	443
2	342	658
10	317	683
25	340	660

2-Norm

Table 2: Best bound frequencies for the upper bounds with n=10.

m	P	Q	$A_0^{-1}P$	$B_0^{-1}Q$	Q_R
1	87 (9)	33 (21)	87 (9)	43 (24)	81 (9)
2	49 (13)	16 (13)	65 (13)	25 (18)	67 (11)
10	10 (6)	4 (4)	27 (10)	8 (10)	39 (9)
25	4 (3)	2 (2)	16 (7)	5 (6)	29 (8)

1-Norm

m	P	Q	$A_0^{-1}P$	$B_0^{-1}Q$	Q_R
1	87 (9)	34 (21)	87 (9)	43 (24)	83 (9)
2	49 (13)	16 (13)	65 (13)	26 (18)	70 (11)
10	9 (6)	4 (5)	27 (10)	9 (10)	42 (10)
25	4 (3)	2 (3)	16 (7)	5 (6)	31 (9)

∞-Norm

m	P	Q	$A_0^{-1}P$	$B_0^{-1}Q$	Q_R
1	87 (9)	38 (23)	87 (9)	45 (25)	87 (8)
2	61 (14)	21 (17)	71 (13)	29 (20)	78 (12)
10	25 (10)	7 (9)	39 (12)	11 (13)	54 (12)
25	15 (7)	4 (6)	26 (9)	6 (9)	42 (11)

2-Norm

Table 3: Comparison of the lower bounds with $n = 10$.

m	$A_0^{-1}P$	$B_0^{-1}Q$	Q_R
1	761	9	230
2	395	19	586
10	85	17	898
25	48	11	941

1-Norm

m	$A_0^{-1}P$	$B_0^{-1}Q$	Q_R
1	720	22	258
2	277	19	704
10	99	7	894
25	56	3	941

∞-Norm

m	$A_0^{-1}P$	$B_0^{-1}Q$	Q_R
1	394	15	591
2	175	11	814
10	76	9	915
25	61	3	936

2-Norm

Table 4: Best bound frequencies for the lower bounds with $n = 10$.

Example 2

In this example we illustrate the effect of Lemma 4.1 on the ability of Theorem 3.3 to produce a gap between the moduli of two groups of eigenvalues. To do so we have generated two differents classes of matrix polynomials of degree $n = 14$ with $m \times m = 25 \times 25$ matrix coefficients of the form

$$P(z) = Iz^{14} + A_{13}z^{13} + \cdots + A_0 \ .$$

The elements of the matrices A_j in the first class have real and imaginary parts that are uniformly distributed in $[-75, 75]$, $[-250, 250]$, $[-5, 5]$, and $[-1, 1]$ for $j = 7$, $j = 8$, $j = 9$, and $j \neq 7, 8, 9, 13$, respectively. One thousand such polynomials were generated for which the real and imaginary parts of the elements of A_{13} are in the intervals $[-\eta, \eta]$, where $\eta = 0.25, 0.125, 0$.

For the second class, the elements of the matrices A_j have real and imaginary parts that are uniformly distributed in $[-75, 75]$, $[-250, 250]$, and $[-1, 1]$ for $j = 11$, $j = 12$, and $j \neq 11, 12, 13$, respectively. One thousand such polynomials were generated for which the real and imaginary parts of the elements of A_{13} are in the intervals $[-\eta, \eta]$, where $\eta = 0.5, 0.25, 0.125, 0$.

For each matrix polynomial, we checked if Theorem 3.3 was applicable with and without the use of Lemma 4.1 and if it was, computed the ratio of the gap between the moduli of the two groups of eigenvalues derived from that theorem to the actual gap. The theorem was applied to both P and Q, and also to $A_k^{-1}P$ and $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$, with $k = 8$ for the first class and $k = 12$ for the second class of matrix polynomials.

Throughout this example, only the 1-Norm was used. Similar results are obtained for the ∞-Norm. Although it generally delivers better results, we considered the 2-Norm's computational cost to be too high to make it practical.

On the left in Table 5 are listed, for the first class of polynomials, the number of times (out of 1000 cases) Theorem 3.3 produced a gap between the $mk = 200$ smallest and $m(n-k) = 150$ largest eigenvalues for each value of η when applied to the matrix polynomials $A_k^{-1}P$ and $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ with $k = 8$. The table contains the total number of computed gaps for each matrix polynomial as well as the number of times each matrix polynomial was the only one of the two for which a gap could be computed. On the right in Table 5 are listed, as percentages, the means of the ratios of the gap from Theorem 3.3 to the actual gap, with the standard deviations between parentheses. The rightmost column lists the percentage of cases where the gap for $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ was larger than the one for $A_k^{-1}P$ when a gap was produced for both. Not enough gaps were computed when Theorem 3.3 was applied to P and Q to make a comparison worthwile.

Table 6 and Table 7 are the analogous tables for the second class of matrix polynomials with $k = 12$. Here, we have also compared the results obtained by applying Theorem 3.3 to P and Q. Overall, the results obtained by applying Lemma 4.1 improve as $||A_{13}||$ becomes smaller, which is understandable since it tends to keep $||B_j||$ ($j = 0, \ldots, n/2 - 1$) of the same order of magnitude as $||A_j||$ ($j = 0, \ldots, n - 1$). This is more important here than for mere upper and lower bounds as in Example 1, because the existence or nonexistence of positive roots for f_k in Theorem 3.3 is heavily dependent on the relative magnitudes of its coefficients.

The results for $k = 8$ in Table 5 show clearly that the application of Lemma 4.1 improves the number of times Theorem 3.3 can be applied. Although it does not always increase the average gap width, it was observed that the gap for $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ was usually wider than the one for $A_k^{-1}P$ whenever a gap can be computed for both. In addition, the gap width is often less important than the very ability to compute a gap in the first place.

For $k = 12$ we find similar results for P and Q in Table 6, with a large number of cases in which a gap could be computed for Q, but not for P. The numbers in Table 7 are more favorable towards $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ for the number of detected gaps, whereas for the gap width they are more favorable towards $A_k^{-1}P$, although the difference diminishes with diminishing $||A_{13}||$. For this example we found that the results for Q are not much worse than those for $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$, which is more costly to compute.

η	$A_k^{-1}P$ TOTAL	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ TOTAL	$A_k^{-1}P$ ONLY	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ ONLY
0.25	40	69	2	31
0.125	42	161	0	119
0	53	192	0	139

Gap frequency

η	$A_k^{-1}P$	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$	% Gap($B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$) ¿ Gap($A_k^{-1}P$)
0.25	23 (13)	19 (9)	64
0.125	24 (11)	22 (10)	93
0	23 (120	25 (11)	99

Gap ratio

Table 5: Gap frequencies and gap ratios for $A_k^{-1}P$ and $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ when $n = 14$, $m = 25$, and $k = 8$.

η	P TOTAL	Q TOTAL	P ONLY	Q ONLY
0.5	338	515	0	177
0.25	378	763	0	385
0.125	357	758	0	401
0	366	757	0	391

Gap frequency

η	P	Q	% Gap(Q) ¿ Gap(P)
0.5	21 (9)	13 (5)	15
0.25	22 (9)	20 (7)	56
0.125	23 (9)	22 (8)	74
0	23 (9)	23 (9)	85

Gap ratio

Table 6: Gap frequencies and gap ratios for P and Q when $n = 14$, $m = 25$, and $k = 12$.

η	$A_k^{-1}P$ TOTAL	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ TOTAL	$A_k^{-1}P$ ONLY	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ ONLY
0.5	759	766	11	18
0.25	794	880	1	87
0.125	767	859	0	92
0	751	863	0	112

Gap frequency

η	$A_k^{-1}P$	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$	% Gap($B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$) ¿ Gap($A_k^{-1}P$)
0.5	29 (10)	15 (5)	8
0.25	29 (10)	21 (7)	8
0.125	29 (10)	24 (7)	11
0	29 (9)	24 (9)	15

Gap ratio

Table 7: Gap frequencies and gap ratios for $A_k^{-1}P$ and $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ when $n = 14$, $m = 25$, and $k = 12$.

Example 3

This example is analogous to Example 2. Here, $n = 4$, $m = 50$, and $k = 2$. The elements of A_j, for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, have real and imaginary parts that are uniformly distributed in $[-0.5, 0.5]$, multiplied by a random number which is uniformly distributed in $[0, 10]$ for $j = 0, 1$, in $[0, 80]$ for $j = 2$, and in $[0, \eta]$ for $j = 3$, where $\eta = 1, 0.5, 0.25, 0$. One thousand such polynomials were generated for each value of η. The results are collected in Table 8 and Table 9. Again, only the the 1-Norm was used.

The results are similar to those obtained for Example 2, although here they are significantly better for $A_k^{-1}P$ and $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ than for P and Q, respectively, which seems to be due to the larger value of m. We note that, contrary to the quartic polynomials P and $A_k^{-1}P$, Q and $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ are quadratic matrix polynomials for which the roots of f_k in Theorem 3.3 are trivial to compute.

η	P TOTAL	Q TOTAL	P ONLY	Q ONLY
1	22	25	8	11
0.5	36	47	8	19
0.25	56	86	6	36
0	92	185	0	93

Gap frequency

η	P	Q	% Gap(Q) ¿ Gap(P)
1	15 (7)	15 (8)	36
0.5	14 (7)	14 (7)	47
0.25	14 (7)	15 (7)	68
0	18 (8)	17 (8)	97

Gap ratio

Table 8: Gap frequencies and gap ratios for P and Q when $n = 4$, $m = 50$, and $k = 2$.

η	$A_k^{-1}P$ TOTAL	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ TOTAL	$A_k^{-1}P$ ONLY	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ ONLY
1	272	124	162	14
0.5	304	235	91	22
0.25	288	297	22	31
0	319	420	0	101

Gap frequency

η	$A_k^{-1}P$	$B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$	% Gap($B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$) ¿ Gap($A_k^{-1}P$)
1	18 (8)	14 (8)	14
0.5	20 (8)	15 (7)	12
0.25	20 (8)	17 (7)	21
0	21 (8)	20 (8)	84

Gap ratio

Table 9: Gap frequencies and gap ratios for $A_k^{-1}P$ and $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ when $n = 4$, $m = 50$, and $k = 2$.

Example 4

This example illustrates how Lemma 4.1, applied to scalar polynomials ($m = 1$), can sometimes be used to provide gaps between the moduli of zeros of a polynomial when the classical scalar version of Pellet's theorem cannot. To this end, we have generated 1000 scalar polynomials of the form

$$p(z) = z^{20} + a_{19}z^{19} + \cdots + a_0 \ ,$$

where the coefficients a_j are random real numbers, uniformly distributed on $[-2, -1] \cup [1, 2]$ for $j = 3, 5, 11, 13$, on $[-10, -8] \cup [8, 10]$ for $j = 4$, on $[-16, -14] \cup [14, 16]$ for $j = 12$, and on $[-1, 1]$ for all $j \neq 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13$. Theorem 3.3 was applied for $k = 4, 12$. Because the matrices involved are all 2×2, we have used the 2-Norm, which can easily be computed in this case and we have applied Theorem 3.3 only to $B_{k/2}^{-1}Q$ since the matrix multiplications are not costly and the results are better than for Q.

The results are displayed in Table 10 in the same format as for the previous example. The designation $A_k^{-1}P$ is replaced by p since for the scalar version of Pellet's theorem there is no difference between its application to p and to $a_k^{-1}p$. The numbers of times that a gap could be computed for both $k = 4$ and $k = 12$ for the same polynomial are listed in Table 11.

For $k = 4$, more gaps are detected by the classical Pellet theorem than when combining Lemma 4.1 with the generalized Pellet theorem (Theorem 3.3), although there are still 21 cases where the latter does provide a gap when the classical Pellet theorem cannot and that gap is also wider in 29% of the cases when both provide a gap. For $k = 12$, the situation is reversed: using the generalized Pellet theorem for $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ delivers significantly better results than using the scalar Pellet theorem for p.

As Table 11 shows, $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ delivered a gap for both $k = 4$ and $k = 12$ in 30 cases more than the 4 cases in which the classical Pellet theorem did.

k	p TOTAL	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ TOTAL	p ONLY	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ ONLY
4	378	223	176	21
12	59	98	9	48

Gap frequency

k	p	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$	% Gap($B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$) ¿ Gap(p)
4	44 (18)	37 (15)	29
12	26 (13)	28 (13)	82

Gap ratio

Table 10: Gap frequencies and gap ratios for p and $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ when $n = 20$, $m = 1$, and $k = 4, 12$.

p TOTAL	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ TOTAL	p ONLY	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ ONLY
23	49	4	30

Table 11: Gap frequencies when $n = 20$ and $m = 1$ for *both* $k = 4$ and $k = 12$.

Example 5

For this example, which has the same purpose as Example 4, we have generated two classes of scalar lacunary polynomials with random complex coefficients. The first class consists of polynomials of the form

$$z^{20} + a_7 z^7 + a_6 z^6 + a_5 z^5 + a_3 z^3 + a_2 z^2 + a_1 z + a_0 \ ,$$

where the real and imaginary parts of a_j are uniformly distributed on $[-2, -1] \cup [1, 2]$ for $j = 1, 3, 5, 7$, on $[-4, 4]$ for $j = 0$, on $[-10, -8] \cup [8, 10]$ for $j = 2$, and on $[-16, -14] \cup [14, 16]$ for $j = 6$.

The second class consists of random polynomials of the form

$$z^{40} + a_7 z^7 + a_6 z^6 + a_5 z^5 + a_3 z^3 + a_2 z^2 + a_1 z + a_0 \ ,$$

where the real and imaginary parts of a_j are distributed as in the first class.

The results are presented in Table 12 analogously as for the previous example. Although the average gap is slightly narrower for $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ than for p when $k = 2$, the reverse is true for $k = 6$ and there is a clear advantage of $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ over p in the number of computed gaps. In addition, there are significantly more cases where using $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ produced a gap for both $k = 2$ and $k = 6$, than when using p. As n increases, using $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ becomes increasingly advantageous.

n/k	p TOTAL	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ TOTAL	p ONLY	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ ONLY
20 / 2	127	147	12	32
20 / 6	386	587	27	228
40 / 2	117	135	18	36
40 / 6	5	43	0	38

Gap frequency

n/k	p	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$	% Gap($B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$) ¿ Gap(p)
20 / 2	53 (20)	41 (16)	30
20 / 6	31 (13)	36 (14)	87
40 / 2	49 (20)	42 (15)	35
40 / 6	19 (16)	23 (12)	80

Gap ratio

Table 12: Gap frequencies and gap ratios for p and $B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ when $n = 20, 40$, $m = 1$, and $k = 2, 6$.

n	p TOTAL	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ TOTAL	p ONLY	$B^{-1}_{k/2}Q$ ONLY
20	97	123	14	40
40	3	24	0	21

Table 13: Gap frequencies when $n = 20, 40$ and $m = 1$ for *both* $k = 2$ and $k = 6$.

4.2 Scalar polynomials as matrix polynomials

In the remainder of this work, we concentrate on scalar polynomials. More specifically, we propose another way (different from Lemma 4.1) to try and overcome situations where the real polynomial f_k in Theorem 1.1 does not have positive roots. It is obtained by expressing a scalar polynomial as the determinant of a matrix polynomial for which the generalized matrix version of the theorem will provide a gap where the scalar version could not. As before, it may appear counterintuitive to use the generalized form of the theorem to improve the original theorem. There are infinitely many ways to write a scalar polynomial in such a form and the best way to proceed is, a priori, not clear. As an example, consider the polynomial $z^4 - z^2 + 3z - 2$. It can be written as

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} z^2 - \sqrt{2} & z \\ z - 3 & z^2 + \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} = \det \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} z^2 + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} z + \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ -3 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} \right) ,$$

but it can also be written as, e.g.,

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} z^2 & -1 \\ 3z - 2 & z^2 - 1 \end{pmatrix} = \det \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} z^2 + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 \end{pmatrix} z + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -2 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right) .$$

Furthermore, one is not limited to using 2 × 2 matrices, and matrices of larger size can also be used. In addition, this approach is, as before, not applicable for every value of k in Theorem 1.1. On the other hand, it does provide, in general, new upper and/or lower bounds on the moduli of the zeros.

Although it is difficult to predict which of the equivalent matrix polynomial representations of a general scalar polynomial will yield the best results, there seems to be some indication that better results are obtained if the coefficients are, in a sense, equally distributed among the elements of the matrix polynomial. This distribution therefore needs to be tailored to the particular polynomial under consideration, which makes it difficult to formulate a general method. The following lemma suggests how to proceed by showing how to accomplish this with 2 × 2 matrices for a class of lacunary polynomials.

Lemma 4.2 *Let*

$$p(z) = az^n + bz^{n-1} + cz^{n-2} + \alpha z^2 + \beta z + \gamma \, , \tag{7}$$

where $a\alpha \neq 0$*, and let*

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{a} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{a} \end{pmatrix} \;,\; B = \begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} + i\left(c - \dfrac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & \dfrac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} - i\left(c - \dfrac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2} \end{pmatrix} \;,$$

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \;,\; D = \begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} + i\left(c - \dfrac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{a} \end{pmatrix} \;,\; E = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dfrac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} - i\left(c - \dfrac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2} \end{pmatrix} \;,$$

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sqrt{\alpha} \\ \sqrt{\alpha} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \;,\; \textit{and } W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\dfrac{\beta}{2\sqrt{\alpha}} - i\left(\gamma - \dfrac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right)^{1/2} \\ \dfrac{\beta}{2\sqrt{\alpha}} - i\left(\gamma - \dfrac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right)^{1/2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \,.$$

Then the zeros of p *are the eigenvalues of the matrix polynomial*

$$Q_{even}(z) = Az^{n/2} + Bz^{n/2-1} + Vz + W \tag{8}$$

when its degree n *is even, and they are the finite eigenvalues of*

$$Q_{odd}(z) = Cz^{(n+1)/2} + Dz^{(n-1)/2} + Ez^{(n-3)/2} + Vz + W$$

when its degree n *is odd.*

Proof. The polynomial p can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p(z) &= az^n + bz^{n-1} + cz^{n-2} + \alpha z^2 + \beta z + \gamma \\ &= az^{n-2}\left(z^2 + \frac{b}{a}z + \frac{c}{a}\right) + \alpha\left(z^2 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha}z + \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\right) \\ &= z^{n-2}\left(a\left(z + \frac{b}{2a}\right)^2 + c - \frac{b^2}{4a}\right) + \left(\alpha\left(z + \frac{\beta}{2\alpha}\right)^2 + \gamma - \frac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that n is even. After factoring the second order expressions, we obtain

$$p(z) = \det \begin{pmatrix} z^{n/2-1}\left(\sqrt{a}z + \frac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} + i\left(c - \frac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2}\right) & -\sqrt{\alpha}z - \frac{\beta}{2\sqrt{\alpha}} - i\left(\gamma - \frac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right)^{1/2} \\ \sqrt{\alpha}z + \frac{\beta}{2\sqrt{\alpha}} - i\left(\gamma - \frac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right)^{1/2} & z^{n/2-1}\left(\sqrt{a}z + \frac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} - i\left(c - \frac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

which is easily seen to be equivalent to $\det(Q_{even}(z))$, with

$$Q_{even}(z) = Az^{n/2} + Bz^{n/2-1} + Vz + W \; ,$$

where the 2×2 matrices A, B, V, and W are defined in the statement of the lemma.

When n is odd, we can similarly write p as

$$p(z) = \det \begin{pmatrix} z^{(n-1)/2}\left(\sqrt{a}z + \frac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} + i\left(c - \frac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2}\right) & -\sqrt{\alpha}z - \frac{\beta}{2\sqrt{\alpha}} - i\left(\gamma - \frac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right)^{1/2} \\ \sqrt{\alpha}z + \frac{\beta}{2\sqrt{\alpha}} - i\left(\gamma - \frac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right)^{1/2} & z^{(n-3)/2}\left(\sqrt{a}z + \frac{b}{2\sqrt{a}} - i\left(c - \frac{b^2}{4a}\right)^{1/2}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

which is equivalent to $\det(Q_{odd}(z))$, with

$$Q_{odd}(z) = Cz^{(n+1)/2} + Dz^{(n-1)/2} + Ez^{(n-3)/2} + Vz + W \; ,$$

where the 2×2 matrices C, D, E, V, and W are defined in the statement of the lemma.
$\square$

Lemma 4.2 can now be used in conjunction with Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 to obtain additional and/or improved results for the scalar versions of these theorems, as long as the appropriate matrices are nonsingular. In this regard we note that the matrices A and V are always nonsingular since we assumed that $a\alpha \neq 0$, and the matrices C and E are always singular. As with Lemma 4.1, not all of the scalar bounds can be improved, but enough can to make it worthwile. When applying a similar process as in Lemma 4.2 to a general polynomial, the bounds, for a particular value of k, require $\mathcal{O}(n)$ operations since the coefficient matrices of the equivalent matrix polynomial are always of size 2×2. Similarly to what we had before, the degrees of the new matrix polynomials Q_{even} and Q_{odd} are half and roughly half that of P, respectively.

Remarks. Although we will not pursue the matter further, Lemma 4.2 allows for many variations on its theme. For instance, a polynomial of the form $az^n+bz^{n-1}+cz^{n-2}+\alpha z+\beta$ with $a\alpha \neq 0$ becomes of the form of a polynomial as in Lemma 4.2 with $\gamma = 0$ after multiplication by z, so that the lemma becomes applicable to such polynomials as well. Moreover, the lacunary polynomial p in Lemma 4.2 is a special case for $r = s = 1$ of the polynomial

$$az^{n+2r-2} + bz^{n+r-2} + cz^{n-2} + \alpha z^{2s} + \beta z^s + \gamma \; ,$$

where $r \geq 1$ and $s \geq 1$ are integers. Lemma 4.2 can easily be modified to include these more general polynomials. The polynomials can be further generalized by replacing z with a polynomial in z.

The following example illustrates how Lemma 4.2 can be used to improve upper and lower bounds on the moduli of the zeros of a polynomial and also to detect gaps between groups of zeros where the classical scalar Pellet theorem cannot, or to improve the width of the gaps that it does detect.

Example 6

For this example, we have generated 1000 polynomials of the form (7), with random parameters a, b, c, α, β, and γ uniformly distributed in $[-50, 50]$ and for $n = 10, 20, 40, 80$. Both the upper and lower bounds from Theorem 3.4 and its scalar version were computed, as well as the bounds from Theorem 3.3 and its scalar version for $k = 2$ and $k = n - 2$, i.e., bounds on the gap between 2 and $n - 2$ zeros. These bounds were computed for both p and Q_{even}. The matrices B and W defining Q_{even} were nonsingular in all cases. Again, as before, because all matrices involved are 2×2, we used only the 2-Norm.

We have computed means and standard deviations of ratios and expressed them as percentages and we have listed gap frequencies with the same conventions as in the previous examples. The results were collected in the tables below.

Table 14 lists the ratios of the upper and lower bounds to the moduli of the largest and smallest zeros, respectively. The designation "scalar" and "matrix" refers to the use of p from (7) and Q_{even} from (8), respectively. The last three columns list the percentage of cases for which using Q_{even} yielded a better result than using p for the upper, lower and both upper and lower bounds on the moduli of the zeros of p. The upper and lower bound ratios using p are quite unaffected by the degree of p, whereas using Q_{even} yields better ratios and smaller standard deviations that improve with increasing degree n.

Table 15 lists the number of times a gap could be computed with both the scalar and generalized (matrix) versions of Theorem 3.3 for $k = 2$ and $k = n-2$. There is a significant advantage to using Q_{even} which, here too, becomes more significant with increasing degree n. The same is true for the number of times both gaps could be computed. To pick but one instance, for $n = 40$ and $k = n - 2$, the classical scalar version of Pellet's theorem finds bounds on the gap between the $n - 2$ smallest and 2 largest zeros 102 times. Using the generalized Pellet theorem with Q_{even} adds another 73 times to that, a significant qualitative difference.

Table 17 contains the means and standard deviations of the gaps and the percentage of times Q_{even} produced a larger gap than p for those cases in which both produced a gap. This was close to half of all cases, while producing a larger average ratio of computed gap to exact gap. The gap may be larger for one or the other although the situation could be reversed for the bounds defining the computed gap. In other words, Q_{even} may produce a smaller gap than p, but its lower gap bound or its upper gap bound may be better. This means that combining the bounds from Q_{even} and p would improve the gap ratio even more.

n	Upper scalar	Upper matrix	Lower scalar	Lower matrix	% Upper better	% Lower better	% Upper and Lower better
10	119 (26)	119 (13)	88 (14)	83 (11)	32	27	10
20	118 (28)	108 (7)	90 (15)	93 (7)	46	42	20
40	119 (29)	103 (4)	90 (16)	98 (4)	65	59	39
80	118 (31)	102 (2)	90 (16)	99 (3)	72	71	51

Table 14: Upper and lower bounds for $n = 10, 20, 40, 80$.

n	$k = 2$ scalar	$k = 2$ matrix	$k = 2$ scalar only	$k = 2$ matrix only	$k = n - 2$ scalar	$k = n - 2$ matrix	$k = n - 2$ scalar only	$k = n - 2$ matrix only
10	41	25	21	5	47	26	26	5
20	81	73	30	22	66	61	31	26
40	123	161	19	57	102	157	18	73
80	127	192	15	80	147	221	11	85

Table 15: Gap frequency for $n = 10, 20, 40, 80$ and $k = 2, n - 2$.

n	$k = 2$ and $k = n - 2$ scalar	$k = 2$ and $k = n - 2$ matrix	$k = 2$ and $k = n - 2$ scalar only	$k = 2$ and $k = n - 2$ matrix only
10	0	0	0	0
20	8	7	6	5
40	14	32	4	22
80	26	45	4	23

Table 16: Gap frequency for $n = 10, 20, 40, 80$ and *both* $k = 2$ and $k = n - 2$.

n	$k = 2$ scalar	$k = 2$ matrix	$k = 2$ % matrix better	$k = n - 2$ scalar	$k = n - 2$ matrix	$k = n - 2$ % matrix better
10	73 (20)	52 (18)	10	70 (25)	68 (21)	58
20	70 (23)	66 (19)	44	68 (28)	71 (19)	46
40	74 (26)	75 (21)	47	72 (29)	80 (19)	48
80	77 (29)	85 (15)	46	71 (31)	85 (17)	54

Table 17: Gap ratio for $n = 10, 20, 40, 80$ and $k = 2, n - 2$.

Finally, we summarize a few more numerical comparisons, but without a detailed breakdown of the results to avoid table overload.

Applying Lemma 4.1 instead of Lemma 4.2 to the polynomials in Example 6 produces results that are generally worse. For $k = 2$, there are only be about half as many gaps, whereas for $k = n - 2$, the scalar and matrix cases are approximately tied.

For the odd case of Lemma 4.2, we have run similar experiments with $n = 11, 21, 41, 81$ and $k = 2, n - 1$ and found that the results for $k = 2$ are similar, but for $k = n - 1$, there are only about half the number of gaps compared to the even case with $k = n - 2$.

We have also compared the scalar and matrix cases for polynomials of the form $az^\ell + bz^{\ell-1} + cz^{\ell-2} + \alpha z + \beta$, mentioned in the remarks following Lemma 4.2, for $\ell = 9, 19, 39, 79$. After multiplication by z, these polynomials are of the form (7) with $n = 10, 20, 40, 80$. We found that the upper bound and the number of gaps when $k = n - 2$ were similarly improved as for the polynomials in Example 6. However, there was no improvement for $k = 2$.

Conclusion. We have presented two ideas to overcome some situations where the generalized Pellet theorem cannot be applied, which at the same time can be used to improve bounds resulting from a limit case of this theorem due to Cauchy. Numerical examples demonstrate the validity of these ideas.

References

[1] Aberth O. *Iteration methods for finding all zeros of a polynomial simultaneously.* Math. Comput., 27 (1973), 339–344.

[2] Bini, D.A. *Numerical computation of polynomial zeros by means of Aberth's method.* Numer. Algorithms, 13 (1996), 179–200.

[3] Bini, D.A., Noferini, V., and Sharify, M. *Locating the eigenvalues of matrix polynomials.* arXiv:1206.3632v2 (2 August 2012).

[4] Cauchy, A.L. *Exercises de mathématique.* Oeuvres (2) Vol. 9 (1829), p.122.

[5] Ehrlich, L.W. *A modified Newton method for polynomials.* Comm. of ACM, 10 (1967), 107–108.

[6] Gohberg, I. and Sigal, E. I. *An operator generalization of the logarithmic residue theorem and Rouch's theorem.* (Russian) Mat. Sb. (N.S.), 84(126) (1971), 607-629. English translation in Math. USSR-Sb., 13 (1971), 603-625.

[7] Gohberg, I., Lancaster, P., and Rodman, L. *Matrix polynomials.* Computer Science and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, Inc., New York-London, 1982.

[8] Gohberg, I., Goldberg, S., and Kaashoek, M. A. *Classes of linear operators. Vol. I.* Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, 49. Birkhuser Verlag, Basel, 1990.

[9] Higham, N.J., Tisseur, F. *Bounds for eigenvalues of matrix polynomials.* Lin. Alg. Appl., 358 (2003), 5-22.

[10] Horn, R. A. and Johnson, C. R. *Matrix Analysis.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.

[11] Lang, S. *Complex Analysis.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[12] Lancaster, P. *Inversion of lambda-matrices and application to the theory of linear vibrations.* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 6 (1960), 105-114.

[13] Lancaster, P. *Lambda Matrices and Vibrating Systems.* Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1966.

[14] Marden, M. *Geometry of polynomials.* Mathematical Surveys, No. 3, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1966.

[15] Melman, A. *Implementation of Pellet's Theorem.* Submitted manuscript, 2012.

[16] Monden, Y. and Arimoto, S. *Generalized Rouché's theorem and its application to multivariate autoregressions.* IEEE trans. on Accoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 28 (1980), 733-738.

[17] Pellet, M.A. *Sur un mode de séparation des racines des équations et la formule de Lagrange.* Bull. Sci. Math., 5 (1881), 393–395.

[18] Rouché, E. *Mémoire sur la série de Lagrange.* J. École Polytech., 22 (1862), 217–218.

[19] Tisseur, F. and Meerbergen, K. *The quadratic eigenvalue problem.* SIAM Rev., 43 (2001), 235-286.

[20] Vaidyanathan, P.P and Mitra, S.K. *A unified structural interpretation of some well-known stability test procedures for linear systems.* Proceedings of the IEEE, 75 (1984), 478–497.